



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

m-f

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,735	10/19/2001	Shingo Uchihashi	CQ10196	6166
23493	7590	10/24/2006	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 401 Castro Street, Ste 220 Mountain View, CA 94041-2007			RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/981,735		UCHIHASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Melur Ramakrishnaiah		2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 8-11, 15, 16, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamura (JP404097685A) in view of Ojala (WO/9819458) and Strubbe et al. (US PAT: 6,850,265, filed 4-13-2000, hereinafter Strubbe).

Regarding claim 1, Kamura discloses a computer aided meeting capture system comprising: meeting capture controller (reads on 11, fig. 1), at least one of camera having plurality of angles and plurality of cameras (1, 3, fig. 1), a sensor (for example 5, fig. 1) to determine the activity information, wherein meeting capture controller provides control information, for selection, at least one of a suggested camera selection and suggested camera angle selection based on sensed activity information and the stored rule information (this is implicit because reference teaches camera selection is based on selection of camera closest to the talker, see abstract).

Kamura differs from claim 1 in that it does not specifically teach displaying camera selection information based on stored object information and stored rule information.

However, Ojala discloses video conference equipment which teaches the following: displaying camera selection information based on stored object information (fig. 4, page 5, line 24 – page 6, line 2); and Strubbe discloses method and apparatus

Art Unit: 2614

for tracking moving objects using combined audio and video information in video conferencing and other applications which teaches the following: stored rule information for camera control (col. 2 lines 18-24, lines 49-59).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Kamura's system for the following: displaying camera selection information based on stored object information and stored rule information as this arrangement would provide rule based camera control with number of advantages as taught by Strubbe (col. 2, line 60 – col. 3, line 6).

Regarding claims 2-4, Kamura further teaches the following: meeting capture controller automatically selects at least one of the suggested camera (1/3, fig. 1) and suggested camera angle for recording sensed activity information, sensed activity information comprises at least one of sound information, movement information and presence information, sound information is obtained from microphones (5-10, fig. 1, see abstract).

Claim 8 is rejected on the same basis as claim 1.

Claims 9-11 are rejected on the same basis as claims 2-4.

Claims 15-16 are rejected on the same basis as claim 1.

Kamura differs from claim 19 in that he does not specifically teach the following: an input device, wherein at least one of suggested camera selection and suggested camera angle selection is manually selected by a user using the input device.

However, Ojala teaches the following: an input device, wherein at least one of suggested camera selection and suggested camera angle selection is manually selected by a user using the input device (fig. 4, page 5, line 24 – page 6, line 2).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Kamura's system for the following: an input device, wherein at least one of suggested camera selection and suggested camera angle selection is manually selected by a user using the input device as this arrangement would provide one of the methods, among many possible methods, to control camera to obtain desired video as taught by Ojala.

Claim 20 is rejected on the same basis as claim 19.

3. Claims 5-6, 12-13, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamura in view of Ojala and Strubbe as applied to claims 1, 8, 17 above, and further in view of Kikuchi et al. (JP 363142779A, hereinafter Kikuchi).

Regarding claim 17, the combination discloses a method of computer assisted meeting capture comprising: providing at least one of camera a having plurality of angels and plurality of cameras, displaying for selection at least one of suggested camera selection and suggested camera angle selection based on determined sensed activity information, stored object position information and stored rule information as explained in rejection of claim 1.

The combination differs from claims 5-6, 12-13, 17 in that although it discloses use of microphone to detect the activity (see abstract of Kamura), it does not teach the

Art Unit: 2614

following: determining activity information from a sensor comprising sensing movement information from at least one of passive infra-red detectors, microwave detectors.

However, Kikuchi teaches the following: determining activity information from a sensor comprising sensing movement information from at least one of passive infra-red detectors, microwave detectors (see abstract).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: determining activity information from a sensor comprising sensing movement information from at least one of passive infra-red detectors, microwave detectors as this arrangement would provide one of the methods, among many possible methods, to control camera to obtain desired video as taught by Kikuchi.

4. Claims 7, 14, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamura in view of Ojala and Strubbe as applied to claims 1, 8, 18 above, and further in view of Kishimoto (JP 410282564A).

Regarding claim 18, the combination discloses a computer assisted meeting capture system comprising: a meeting capture controller, at least one camera having a plurality of angles and a plurality of cameras, a sensor to determine sensed activity information, stored object position information, stored rule information wherein meeting capture controller displays, for selection, at least one of suggested camera and suggested camera angle selection based on sensed activity information, stored object position information and stored rule information, wherein the sensor information

comprises at least one of sound information, movement information and presence information as explained in rejection of claims 1-4.

The combination differs from claims 7, 14, 18 in that he does not teach the following: stored object location information is obtained automatically by at least one of a geo-positioning system signal and mobile locator service signal.

However, Kishimoto discloses camera for recording photographing position which teaches the following: stored object location information is obtained automatically by at least one of a geo-positioning system signal and mobile locator service signal (fig. 1, see abstract).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: stored object location information is obtained automatically by at least one of a geo-positioning system signal and mobile locator service signal as this arrangement would facilitate associating positional information with respect to stored object as taught by Kishimoto.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not


Art Unit: 2614

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (571)272-8098. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 Hr schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curt Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Melur Ramakrishnaiah
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2614